

**REMARKS**

I. Summary of Telephone Conference with the Examiner

One of Applicants' representatives, Melissa Beede (Reg. No. 54,986), held a telephone conference with the Examiner on March 1, 2005 to discuss apparent oversights in the Office Action mailed on February 8, 2004. During the telephone conference, Melissa Beede noted that no mention was made of claims 4-5, 8-10, 12-13, or 17-20 in the restriction requirement of the Office Action. The Examiner stated that these claims should be considered linking claims. Melissa Beede also noted that claim 45 was listed in the Office Action under both Groups I and III. The Examiner stated that this claim should be listed under Group III only.

II. Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action dated February 8, 2005, a Restriction Requirement was made between three groups of claims:

I. Claims 2, 6-7, 39- 44, and 46-55 (Although claim 45 is listed under Group I in the Office Action, it is not listed here as the Examiner indicated during the telephone conference referred to above that the claim should be included in Group III and not in Group I.);

II. Claims 3, 16, and 21-38; and

III. Claims 45 and 56.

Claims 1 and 11 are indicated as linking claims in the Office Action. In addition, claims 4-5, 8-10, 12-13, and 17-20 were indicated as linking claims during the telephone conference with the Examiner, as explained above.

In response to the Examiner's request that Applicants elect an invention to be examined, Applicants elect Group I for examination. Applicants have amended the claims such that the claims of Group II depend either directly or indirectly from linking claims 1 or 11. Claim 56 (Group III) has been amended to depend from independent claim 39, which belongs to elected Group I. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing, all pending independent claims are now linking claims or claims belonging to elected Group I. All pending dependent claims depend from an independent claim that has been deemed to be a linking claim or a claim belonging to elected Group I.

**Conclusion**

A favorable action is respectfully requested. If, for any reason, the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representatives would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
***Thomas P. Allen et al., Applicants***

By: 

James H. Morris, Reg. No. 34,681  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206  
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Docket No.: L0501.70040US00  
Date: March 8, 2005  
x03/08/05x